

" Sir Francis Burdett agreed in almost all the sentiments of the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Whitbread) who had just spoken; but he could not content himself with merely stating his opinion as a protest against the course proposed by Ministers, but he felt it to be his duty to divide the House upon the question. He conceived that course to be so indecorous and insulting to the House, that he would betray his duty to it if he consented to any compromise. If he had had any notice of the meeting of Parliament on the last day, he should have felt it his duty to have attended in his place, and to have made some observations respecting the necessity of providing for the due maintenance of the executive power, without which there could be no legitimate Government in the country. It would be a dangerous thing, indeed, to teach such a lesson to the people, as to make them believe that the executive Government was merely a farce; that the kingly office was not necessary; and that all the functions of it might, without injury to the public, be discharged by the Ministers. There was no doctrine which could possibly bring the kingly office into greater contempt. What could be worse than placing the crown upon a cushion, and leaving all its prerogatives and attributes to the pleasure of Ministers? He felt, in common with all his Majesty's subjects, deep sorrow for the calamity with which he was afflicted, a calamity which had now visited him for the second time; but however much he felt for the King, as a man, he felt still more for the calamities, and perils, and dangers of the country."—Speech in the House of Commons, 15th Nov. 1810.

929]

[930

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

CORN CROPS, BREAD, PRAYER.—Reader, in my last Number, at page 919, I inserted the Order of the King's Privy Council, which is dated on the 17th of October, and at issuing, or, rather making of which Order the King himself is said to have been present. This Order, as you will have seen, commands his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury to prepare a Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the ABUNDANT HARVEST. Then follows the Prayer, as it has been published in all the newspapers, and in the Prayer, God, through the merits and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is thanked for having caused our valleys to be covered with corn. The first day appointed for the using of this Prayer, in the Churches, is the 18th instant; and, as you, reader, may, perhaps, be just going to Church or coming from Church; as you may, possibly, be just going to say, or just come from saying the Prayer, at the moment you will open this Register, I shall endeavour to avail myself of this sober and serious state of your mind, and to impress upon that mind some useful truths upon the subject of the *Corn Crops* and the *Price of Bread*.—Of late, enormous has been the abuse, heaped upon me, for having, in the month of June last, given it as my opinion, that the crop of corn generally, and of wheat in particular, would be very short, and, of course, that corn and bread would be very dear.—The article to which I here refer, will be found in Vol. XVII,

under the date of 23d of June, and at page 935. I had, in a former article, at page 880, given my reason for this opinion, namely, that hundreds and thousands of acres of wheat had been *ploughed up*, and that a great deal of what remained unploughed up was *so thin upon the ground*, that half a crop was not to be expected from it. And, in my article of the 23rd of June, I, upon these, and other grounds that were stated, said: "From America, then, nothing of any consequence can be expected; and the question is, whether Buonaparté will, or will not, permit corn to be sent from the Baltic to England; if the former, the price may possibly be kept a little down; but, if he does not permit us to get corn from the Baltic, my sincere opinion is that wheat will be 30 shillings a bushel, and the quartern loaf half a crown before Christmas."—Supposing this opinion to have been wholly erroneous, and founded upon false grounds. Supposing that it had not been at all warranted by the then appearances. Still, it was, as Mr. ARTHUR YOUNG has observed, in his letter to me, published in the present volume, at page 184, impossible that the publishing of the opinion could *do any harm*; and, Mr. YOUNG adds, that he was glad to see my apprehensions in print. So far, however, were the venal prints from being of Mr. YOUNG's way of thinking, that they not only represented the publication of my apprehensions as *mischievous* in itself, but as proceeding from a *desire to make corn and bread dear*, and thereby to injure the people of this country, to produce

distress and misery amongst them; forgetting, in the heat of their charity, or not being aware, that very few men would be greater sufferers from this cause than myself.—But, in what was my opinion so very erroneous? Any man may be deceived by appearances; and I am not at all anxious about the fate of my opinion upon this matter; yet, as so much as been said about it, in the venal prints in every part of the kingdom, it seems no more than due to myself, and I am sure it is due to the public, to inquire a little how far I was *grounded* in the opinion that I gave.—It will, I think, be allowed, that I have never set myself up as a *conjuror*. At least, I am quite sure, that it will be allowed, that these Venal Gentlemen have never allowed me to possess any powers of penetration beyond those which fall to the share of mortals in general. This being the case, it is, I think, fair to say, that my opinion of the 23d of June must be tried by the *appearances of the Crops at that time*; and, as I saw a great part of the wheat fields without any straw in them, and naturally concluded, that the quantity of wheat would be in proportion to that of the straw, my opinion was, that the quantity of wheat would be very short.—Now, what was the result; What does the High Priest of the Venal Tribe, the Morning Post writer; what does he say was the result? How does his description of the crop agree, or disagree with my opinion of the 23d of June? I am now about to quote what he said, in his paper of the 12th of September, and what, indeed, was said by almost all the news-papers in the kingdom.—“We have this day the happiness of congratulating the people of the United Kingdom on a fact which affords the most unequivocal testimony of the satisfactory state of the harvest, the price of Bread has been lowered five-pence in the Peck Loaf. What will those wise and good men say now, those pure patriots who so sedulously sent forth the comfortable assurance that the quartern loaf would be at *half-a-crown* by Christmas, and who did all they could, unluckily too, not without some success, to raise it as high as it would go, by propagating exaggerated and groundless alarm in the mean time. We have now had three successive weeks of fine weather, during which the far greater part of the corn has been saved. The produce is every where great. Of the last year's crop, it required the produce

“of 90 to 100 wheat-sheaves on the average, to make a bushel; whereas that quantity is obtained in the present year from 50 to 60 sheaves. Barley and Oats are *equally abundant*.”—Now, if this was true, what need have I of any more to justify, fully to justify, my opinion of the 23d of June? What was I to judge from but from the *then appearances*? What was I to judge from but the quantity of straw upon the ground; that is to say, from the quantity of sheaves that there was likely to be? How was I to know, and how was I to imagine that each sheaf and each ear would produce nearly twice as much corn as each sheaf and ear of the preceding crop?—Thus, upon the shewing of the Venal Writers themselves; upon their own acknowledgments; upon their own distinct and unqualified assertions, my opinion was not only not greatly erroneous, but it was wonderfully correct; for if the sheaf of this year had yielded no more than the sheaf of last year, the quartern loaf would, even at this time, have sold at *half a crown*, at least, seeing that, with the nearly double yielding of the sheaf, that loaf now sells at *one shilling and three pence halfpenny*. The venal writers are thus answered, then, without any further ado. They are twisted up in a web of their own weaving; and I might here safely leave them to the contempt of the public.—But, besides the very favourable change in the crops, which no human foresight could be expected to reach, these candid Gentlemen appear to have wholly forgotten, that I attached a condition to my opinion of high price, namely, that Buonaparté should not permit any corn to be exported from the Baltic to England. It was upon this condition that my opinion of the price, in some measure, depended; and, it is perfectly notorious, that many thousands of quarters have been imported every week from that time to the present day. It is not less notorious, that the price of corn and of bread has been kept down by these importations. Nay, I believe, that there can be no doubt at all, that, if the importations were now to stop, the price would be very greatly augmented, if it did not attain (in spite of the double producing sheaves) the height that I predicted, on the condition of a stoppage to importation.—Let us, however, admit, that, contrary to my opinion and my expectations, the harvest has been abundant; and, then, that opens to us, in spite of ourselves, another view of the subject, much more interesting to the public than any

thing can be, which relates either to my judgment or my wishes.—The harvest has now, by the highest authority, been thought; nay, it has been declared and proclaimed, to have been *abundant*; and, by the performance of the most solemn act; the people, the whole nation, are to join in ratifying the fact, in the form of an appeal to the Searcher of Hearts. This fact, therefore, I shall now take to be indubitable. I shall take it to be as impossible to be questioned, as the fact of the Sun's giving light. But, at the same time, it is not a fact better proved; it is not a fact more certain; it is not a fact less to be questioned, than is the fact, that *great importations of corn* have been all the year and are still going on. Whence inevitably results one of two things, either that these importations are *not necessary* for the supplying this nation with bread, and, of course, ought not to be permitted to drain away our *remaining gold*, in which this corn is paid for; or, that England is brought to such a pass, that, even when there is an *abundant harvest*, a harvest so abundant as to call for an order from the government for the people to return particular thanks to Almighty God on account of such abundance; aye, that England is brought to such a pass, that, even in times of her greatest internal abundance, she stands in need of the aid of foreign countries, countries now at the nod of her implacable enemy, to supply her people with bread.—As this is a dilemma, which the Venal Gentleman of the Morning Post seems not to have foreseen, it is but fair to leave him to time to choose the horn on which he shall be exhibited; and, in the meanwhile, reader, we will take a look at what he said, on the 13th of September, about the propriety of a Prayer upon this occasion.—“We are ever ready to offer up our prayers to the Almighty whilst suffering under the immediate pressure of misfortune: when we want rain or sunshine, we appoint Fast Days to interest Divine Providence in our behalf, and to entreat that he would bestow upon us whatever our immediate necessities point out to us as being essentially necessary towards prosperity, or that he would avert some threatened calamity. But when our prayers are heard, and our wants supplied, even to profusion, how very negligent we are in acknowledging the blessing, and in offering up our thanksgiving to the Giver of all good for his merciful

interference.—I am led into these reflections by observing the *plentiful and very excellent appearance of the present harvest*; and there are few things have given me more pleasure than being told by an *aged gleaner*, that she and her little daughter had, with ease, this season, gleaned as much wheat as would supply her with four bushels of excellent flour. Last year she scarcely gleaned *half the quantity*, and that not so good; the best of the corn was of an inferior quality; but that which was left by the reapers, was scarcely worth the labour of gathering, particularly as the heavy rains which fell after the corn was cut, and before it was taken in, exposed the scattered heads to be almost entirely destroyed; not only affording a smaller quantity of flour, but of an *unwholesome quality*. This year, on the other hand, the very worst of the heads of corn are well filled, and the gleaners have been able to gather it in excellent condition, from the long continuation of dry weather after the corn was cut.—This appears to me so important a blessing, that if our hearts do not expand with gratitude, we are unworthy the Divine favour; and I do conceive that we are called upon to offer up our praises and our thanksgivings in the most public and solemn manner.”—Of this opinion the government appear to have been, and, accordingly, in about a month afterwards, the Prayer was, as we have seen, ordered. Acquiescing then, in this opinion, and continuing, of course, to take the premises as indubitable, let me now beg the reader to look at the actual price of the *quartern loaf*. This price is 1s. 3½d. This, then, is the price at a season of abundance; just after the close of an *abundant harvest*; and on the very day appointed for a General Prayer and Thanksgiving for that abundant harvest. This is the price, which the people of England have now to pay in times of *plenty*; a price at which 12 shillings, which is about the average of the country labourer's wages, will purchase about 9 ½ quartern loaves, rather less than 42 pounds of bread,* which, supposing the labourer's family to consist of

* Weight of Bread according to Law.

	lbs.	oz.	dr.
The Peck Loaf	17	6	0
The Half-peck Loaf	8	11	0
The Quartern Loaf	4	5	8
The Half-quartern Loaf	2	2	12

2 G 2

distress and misery amongst them; forgetting, in the heat of their charity, or not being aware, that very few men would be greater sufferers from this cause than myself.—But, in what was my opinion so very erroneous? Any man may be deceived by appearances; and I am not at all anxious about the fate of my opinion upon this matter; yet, as so much as been said about it, in the venal prints in every part of the kingdom, it seems no more than due to myself, and I am sure it is due to the public, to inquire a little how far I was *grounded* in the opinion that I gave.—It will, I think, be allowed, that I have never set myself up as a *conjurer*. At least, I am quite sure, that it will be allowed, that these Venal Gentlemen have never allowed me to possess any powers of penetration beyond those which fall to the share of mortals in general. This being the case, it is, I think, fair to say, that my opinion of the 23d of June must be tried by the *appearances of the Crops at that time*; and, as I saw a great part of the wheat fields without any straw in them, and naturally concluded, that the quantity of wheat would be in proportion to that of the straw, my opinion was, that the quantity of wheat would be very short.—Now, what was the result; What does the High Priest of the Venal Tribe, the Morning Post writer; what does he say was the result? How does his description of the crop agree, or disagree with my opinion of the 23d of June? I am now about to quote what he said, in his paper of the 12th of September, and what, indeed, was said by almost all the news-papers in the kingdom.—“We have this day the happiness of congratulating the people of the United Kingdom on a fact which affords the most unequivocal testimony of the satisfactory state of the harvest, the price of Bread has been lowered five-pence in the Peck Loaf. What will those wise and good men say now, those pure patriots who so sedulously sent forth the comfortable assurance that the quartern loaf would be at *half-a-crown by Christmas*, and who did all they could, unluckily too, not without some success, to raise it as high as it would go, by propagating exaggerated and groundless alarm in the mean time. We have now had three successive weeks of fine weather, during which the far greater part of the corn has been saved. The produce is every where great. Of the last year’s crop, it required the produce

“of 90 to 100 wheat-sheaves on the average, to make a bushel; whereas that quantity is obtained in the present year from 50 to 60 sheaves. Barley and Oats are *equally abundant*.”—Now, if this was true, what need have I of any more to justify, fully to justify, my opinion of the 23d of June? What was I to judge from but from the *then appearances*? What was I to judge from but the quantity of straw upon the ground; that is to say, from the quantity of *sheaves* that there was likely to be? How was I to know, and how was I to imagine that each sheaf and each ear would produce nearly twice as much corn as each sheaf and ear of the preceding crop?—Thus, upon the shewing of the Venal Writers, themselves; upon their own acknowledgments; upon their own distinct and unqualified assertions, my opinion was not only not greatly erroneous, but it was wonderfully correct; for if the sheaf of this year had yielded no more than the sheaf of last year, the quartern loaf would, even at this time, have sold at *half a crown*, at least, seeing that, with the nearly double yielding of the sheaf, that loaf now sells at *one shilling and three pence halfpenny*. The venal writers are thus answered, then, without any further ado. They are twisted up in a web of their own weaving; and I might here safely leave them to the contempt of the public.—But, besides the very favourable change in the crops, which no human foresight could be expected to reach, these candid Gentlemen appear to have wholly forgotten, that I attached a condition to my opinion of high price, namely, that Buonaparté should not permit any corn to be exported from the Baltic to England. It was upon this condition that my opinion of the price, in some measure, depended; and, it is perfectly notorious, that many thousands of quarters have been imported every week from that time to the present day. It is not less notorious, that the price of corn and of bread has been kept down by these importations. Nay, I believe, that there can be no doubt at all, that, if the importations were now to stop, the price would be very greatly augmented, if it did not attain (in spite of the double producing sheaves) the height that I predicted, on the condition of a stoppage to importation.—Let us, however, admit, that, contrary to my opinion and my expectations, the harvest has been abundant; and, then, that opens to us, in spite of ourselves, another view of the subject, much more interesting to the public than any

thing can be, which relates either to my judgment or my wishes.—The harvest has now, by the highest authority, been thought; nay, it has been declared and proclaimed, to have been *abundant*; and, by the performance of the most solemn act; the people, the whole nation, are to join in ratifying the fact, in the form of an appeal to the Searcher of Hearts. This fact, therefore, I shall now take to be indubitable. I shall take it to be as impossible to be questioned, as the fact of the Sun's giving light. But, at the same time, it is not a fact better proved; it is not a fact more certain; it is not a fact less to be questioned, than is the fact, that *great importations of corn* have been all the year and are still going on. Whence inevitably results one of two things, either that these importations are *not necessary* for the supplying this nation with bread, and, of course, ought not to be permitted to drain away our *remaining gold*, in which this corn is paid for; or, that England is brought to such a pass, that, even when there is an *abundant harvest*, a harvest so abundant as to call for an order from the government for the people to return particular thanks to Almighty God on account of such abundance; aye, that England is brought to such a pass, that, even in times of her greatest internal abundance, she stands in need of the aid of foreign countries, countries now at the nod of her implacable enemy, to supply her people with bread.—As this is a dilemma, which the Venal Gentleman of the Morning Post seems not to have foreseen, it is but fair to leave him to time to choose the horn on which he shall be exhibited; and, in the meanwhile, reader, we will take a look at what he said, on the 13th of September, about the propriety of a Prayer upon this occasion.—“We are ever ready to offer up our prayers to the Almighty whilst suffering under the immediate pressure of misfortune: when we want rain or sunshine, we appoint Fast Days to interest Divine Providence in our behalf, and to entreat that he would bestow upon us whatever our immediate necessities point out to us as being essentially necessary towards prosperity, or that he would avert some threatened calamity. But when our prayers are heard, and our wants supplied, *even to profusion*, how very negligent we are in acknowledging the blessing, and in offering up our thanksgiving to the Giver of all good for his merciful

interference.—I am led into these reflections by observing the *plentiful and very excellent appearance of the present harvest*; and there are few things have given me more pleasure than being told by an *aged gleaner*, that she and her little daughter had, with ease, this season, gleaned as much wheat as would supply her with four bushels of excellent flour. Last year she scarcely gleaned *half the quantity*, and that *not so good*; the best of the corn was of an inferior quality; but that which was left by the reapers, was scarcely worth the labour of gathering, particularly as the heavy rains which fell after the corn was cut, and before it was taken in, exposed the scattered heads to be almost entirely destroyed; not only affording a smaller quantity of flour, but of an *unwholesome quality*. This year, on the other hand, the *very worst* of the heads of corn are *well filled*, and the gleaners have been able to gather it in excellent condition, from the long continuation of dry weather after the corn was cut.—This appears to me so important a blessing, that if our hearts do not expand with gratitude, we are *unworthy the Divine favour*; and I do conceive that we are called upon to offer up our praises and our thanksgivings in the most public and solemn manner.”—Of this opinion the government appear to have been, and, accordingly, in about a month afterwards, the Prayer was, as we have seen, ordered. Acquiescing then, in this opinion, and continuing, of course, to take the premises as indubitable, let me now beg the reader to look at the actual price of the *quartern loaf*. This price is 1s. 3½d. This, then, is the price at a season of abundance; just after the close of an *abundant harvest*; and on the very day appointed for a General Prayer and Thanksgiving for that abundant harvest. This is the price, which the people of England have now to pay in times of *plenty*; a price at which 12 shillings, which is about the average of the country labourer's wages, will purchase about 9 ½ quartern loaves, rather less than 42 pounds of bread,* which, supposing the labourer's family to consist of

* Weight of Bread according to Law.

	lbs.	oz.	dr.
The Peck Loaf	17	6	0
The Half-peck Loaf	8	11	0
The Quartern Loaf	4	5	8
The Half-quartern Loaf	2	2	12

4 persons, 2 children besides the man and his wife, will give each of them $1\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of bread a day, supposing them to want neither *meat, drink, clothing, lodging, or fire*; and, if you give the labourer 15 shillings a week, he has 3 shillings left for all these purposes.—Well, but how stands the matter if viewed in the way of comparison? The quartern loaf is now 1s. 3d. $\frac{1}{2}$, and we take the fact for certain that this is a season of *abundance*; what, then, would the price be, if this were a season of *scarcity*? But, to our comparison. This is a year of *abundance*, and of so great abundance as to call for a general Thanksgiving. Now, in the year 1792 (that is to say, by the by, the year before the war against the “Jacobins” of France began) the average price of the quartern loaf, during the whole year, was 6d. $\frac{1}{4}$, much less than *half* of what the price now is. See Political Register, 11th August, 1904, Vol. VI. page 239, where there is a statement of the average price of the quartern loaf for every year for more than *half a century back*.—In the year 1792, when the price of the quartern loaf, during the year, was only 6d. $\frac{1}{4}$, there was not, I believe, any Prayer and Thanksgiving on account of an abundant harvest; whence we may fairly conclude, that the abundance was not so very great and conspicuous as it is now; and, how are we, then, to account for the *difference in the price of the loaf*? If we allow, that this season is not *more* plentiful than that of 1792, still we are to account for this amazing difference in the price; a difference of about one fourth *more than half*. The price is now about one fourth *more than double* of what it was in 1792. How are we to account for this?—The MORNING POST accounts for it as arising from *fraud and roguery* of various sorts, and seems to wish to see the price lowered by some species of *force*, or, at least of *summary justice*. There are four articles, which have appeared in this print, since the 8th instant inclusive, which I shall here insert, and to which I beg the reader’s attention. —The first, that of the 8th instant, was in the following words:—“We are happy to find that the worthy Lord Mayor has attended to our recommendation upon this subject. A small reduction, a farthing in the quartern loaf, takes place this day in the price of bread. We understand that the Lord Mayor, upon a consideration of the usual returns, and a comparison of the relative prices of wheat and flour,

“would have felt himself justified in reducing the assize sevenpence in the peck loaf. “The quartern loaf would then have been sold for fourteen pence. Upon a representation however, from the bakers, that hundreds of them must be ruined by so sudden and excessive a fall (most of them having laid in their stock at an exorbitant price), and that in the ensuing week bread would again rise, his Lordship was obliged to relinquish his benevolent determination. The interview between his Lordship and the bakers lasted for nearly two hours; in the course of which his Lordship shewed that he was fully acquainted with the artifices by which the price of bread had been kept up, and that he was determined to frustrate them. There has not been so great a disproportion for the last 34 years between the prices of wheat and meal as at present. The bakers pretended to account for the enormous price of the latter by the want of water in the early part of the summer to work the mills; an excuse which the Lord Mayor very properly remarked they certainly had no pretext for assigning for some time past. The zeal and ability with which his Lordship has taken up this very important subject, afford a well-grounded hope that the abuses which have contributed to keep up the price of bread will be checked at least, if not wholly removed before he retires from office.”—The reader will do well to guard himself against the belief of any part of what is here said to have proceeded from the LORD MAYOR, of which the writer of the Morning Post could know no more than any one of Mr. Perceval’s coachmen, or, indeed, one of his coach-horses. It is all *fiction* from the beginning to the end; for, though the Lord Mayor is what he is here described to be, he is not less just and considerate towards the sellers than he is towards the buyers of bread; and he knows as well as any man living, that, to attempt to force prices downwards is, in reality, to force them upwards; because, to the real current value of the article you thereby add the charge for risk from popular violence and the certainty of popular odium, which no man will encounter voluntarily.—On the 9th instant the same writer resumed the subject thus:—“I find it to be a fact, that there are people in the market who combine in their own persons the triple character of Factor, Miller, and Baker;

"ny, that it has become as common for
 "millers to take bakers' shops, and put in
 "their own servants, as it is for brewers to
 "take public houses! and the same con-
 "sequences will always follow, namely,
 "bad article at a low price. But even
 "when *bonâ fide* sales of flour are made, it
 "is a common trick to deliver false in-
 "voices, and charge 5s. or 6s. a sack more
 "than is actually paid! Sometimes a
 "sack or two of remarkably fine flour for
 "Confectioners may be sold at a very
 "high price, and this is *foisted in* to aug-
 "ment the average price, although it is
 "not fit for bread at all."—To the next
 paragraph, stupid and brutal as it is, I so-
 licit the particular attention of the public,
 that public who have so long heard this
 same venal print talking of the *coarseness*
 and *vulgarity* of others; and, I take this
 occasion to observe, that this charge of
 coarseness and vulgarity is never prefer-
 red, except as the means of throwing dis-
 reputation upon truth.—The paragraph
 makes part of a letter, evidently written
 by the editor himself, under the feigned
 title of a letter from a poor unfortunate
 creature, now in London, called the
 "HOTTENTOT VENUS," to LORD "GRIN-
 "WELL," meaning Lord Grenville. The
 paragraph is as follows, from the Morn-
 ing Post of the 9th instant.—"Dere
 "many good tings in dis country; plen-
 "ty money and plenty to eat; de worst
 "is the bread so dear; dey charge great
 "deal for small loaf; dis very bad, as
 "plenty of corn; must be bad rogues
 "somewhere. *Hang de rascals or pillory,*
 "as toder day in de Haymarket. People
 "tell me Mare look into it; if Mare look
 "into it, *why he no lower de bread more den*
 "*penny when ought to fall sevenpence.* Dey
 "say baker bread-men be ruined if do,
 "'cause dey buy much flour at high
 "price; whose fault dat? dey no ob-
 "liged to run before market; dey buy
 "when high, tinkin it will be great deal
 "more dear. Dey fools to believe dat
 "liar Cobbett and speculate. What bu-
 "siness dey speculate? Me tink Mare
 "ought to say, 'If you baker bread-men
 "gamble, must take consequence; you no
 "business to speculate if can't afford to
 "run risk. What *de Devil* right have you
 "to expect de Public to suffer because
 "you fools? If ruined serve you right.
 "No tell me bread ought not fall dis
 "week, 'cause must rise next, better say
 "will be dear next year, so ought be
 "sold at half-crown dis. If you out in

"calculations like *de Newgate bird*, you is
 "de peoples dat should suffer, and not de
 "poor honest hard work-man, so no dam
 "nonsense, lower de quartern loaf." Dat
 "me tink should be said by Mare—My
 "Lord, your sarvant."—Now, reader,
 when you have had the patience to read
 this through, I beg you, either before or
 after you have been to the Prayer and
 Thanksgiving, to consider soberly of the
 tendency of the print in which it was
 published. I beg you to consider what
 sort of persons those must be, who,
 in any way whatever, and in any degree
 however small, contribute towards the
 support or encouragement of such a
 publication. And, I put it to your good
 sense, to your sense of propriety and
 your regard for decency, whether it be
 not your duty to do all that in you lies to
 put down a thing so offensive to public
 morals and so directly tending to the de-
 struction of even the forms of law and of
 justice.—This paragraph, you will ob-
 serve, is taken from a print, known by
 the name of the "FASHIONABLE WORLD'S"
 news-paper. This is the print, which ad-
 dresses itself more immediately to the
Fashionable part of this Metropolis; and,
 if we are to judge of the readers by what
 they read, what are we to think of them?
 What are we to think of that father of a
 family, who can admit such a publication
 within his doors? Can we regard such a
 man as worthy of respect, or, indeed, as
 fit for the society of people of honourable
 minds?—Our country is, in many re-
 spects, *under a cloud*; but, in no way what-
 ever is it so much disgraced and disho-
 noured as by these venal writers; men
 without talent; men who do what no talent,
 even of the very humblest sort, would sub-
 mit to; the miserable instruments of
 MEANNESS, MERCENARINESS, and
 MALIGNITY. Talk of an *enlightened*
 people! Amongst what people upon earth,
 but this, would such a print be suffered to
 exist, much less be encouraged and sup-
 ported?—We left this writer *cursing*, on
 the 9th, be not surprized, therefore, if you
 find him *praying* on the 14th.—"Yes-
 "terday the Lord Mayor inspected the
 "Meal-weighers' Reports, and ordered
 "the price of Bread to be continued at
 "1s. 3½d. the quartern loaf of wheaten,
 "and 1s. 2d. household.—Every week
 "serves more and more to prove that the
 "most extensive iniquitous proceedings
 "must be resorted to by the dealers in
 "flour to keep up the price of that article,

“and thereby mock the bounty and blessings
 “of Providence, so eminently bestowed
 “upon the land in the late abundant harvest.
 “It is most vexatious and melancholy to
 “contemplate, that while we are in our
 “prayers returning thanks to Heaven for its
 “distinguished favour in this respect, and the
 “price of wheat continues almost every
 “market day to fall, the price of flour, by
 “which that of bread is regulated, should
 “thus iniquitously be kept up, in sinful de-
 “fiance of the manifold bounty and mercy of
 “God. The worthy Lord Mayor must,
 “we are persuaded, feel as much grieved
 “on this occasion as ourselves, and we
 “have no doubt that he will use every
 “means, which the extent of his high
 “office affords, of correcting so crying an
 “evil, and doing justice to the Public, who
 “look to him with confidence for redress,
 “as far as redress is in his power.”—This
 caps the climax of craft, cant, and cajo-
 lery, in which triple quality this writer
 excels all his fellow-labourers, though
 they are, by no means few in number. I
 put it to you, reader, whether there ever
 was, at any former period, either in Eng-
 land or any other country, an instance of
 such despicable cant, such miserable ri-
 baldry, such bald and barefaced balder-
 dash, having met with encouragement and
 support; and, I put to you, if you be one
 of its supporters, whether you act the part
 of a man either of honour or of sense. In
 many publications in AMERICA you meet
 with what is rough, and, if you will, very
 coarse. A great deal of rudeness some-
 times; a neglect of good manners. But,
 amongst all this, you are sure to find wit,
 or argument, or valuable fact; you are
 sure to find something or other for the
 mind to rest upon with satisfaction; while,
 in the venal prints in England, you find
 hypocrisy, falshood, and foolery, unre-
 lieved by even a transient gleam of any
 thing bespeaking the possession of intel-
 lect, by any thing, which, for a moment,
 can make you doubt, that, in the mind of
 the writer, the only struggle is between
 ignorance and turpitude; and, you, at last,
 lay down the paper, revolving in your
 mind, whether he be too great a fool to
 be a knave, or too great a knave to be a
 fool.—In dismissing this subject, I shall,
 I am persuaded, be excused for just notic-
 ing the charge, that I was induced to en-
 deavour to raise the price of corn for the sake
 of selling my own the dearer. The fact is,
 that I never had but thirty one acres of
 wheat in my life; and I have not, this

year, more than enough for the consump-
 tion of my own house. Add to this, that,
 if wheat be dear, all the articles necessary
 in the support of a family are dear in po-
 portion; while, as the public must well
 know, my publications have a fixed price;
 so that, from the dearness of wheat and of
 bread, I am sure to be a loser. I have said
 this in order to remove any little doubt
 that may, from a long string of unanswer-
 ed falshoods, have been imbibed by per-
 sons entitled to my respect; and for the
 further reason of bringing my friends, who
 do not know me personally, to as near an
 acquaintance as I can with all that belongs
 to me and my affairs.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.—King's
 Illness.—Agreeably to the adjournment on
 the 1st instant, as stated at page 822, the
 two Houses met on the 15th instant. In
 both Houses, the Ministers moved for an-
 other adjournment to the 29th instant,
 which motions were finally carried; but,
 not without some debate, which debate is
 of a nature to call for our particular notice.
 —In the HOUSE OF LORDS, the
 LORD CHANCELLOR (Eldon), after some
 preliminary matter, said: “This is the
 “unanimous opinion (I am anxious to state
 “their own words) not only of the phy-
 “sicians then in attendance, but of those
 “whose care has since been thrown around
 “his Majesty, and is given with as much
 “certainty as can be attached to prog-
 “nostics upon medical subjects. Those
 “physicians also who now attend his Ma-
 “jesty, and who attended his Majesty on
 “a former indisposition, state, that they see
 “in the present state of his Majesty, all the
 “symptoms of approach towards recovery,
 “and none of the symptoms which indicate
 “the delay of recovery. Upon the state-
 “ment which I made on the 1st of this
 “month, one of your Lordships moved to
 “adjourn for fourteen days, the shortest
 “period within which Parliament can by
 “law be assembled upon any emergency
 “for the dispatch of business: your Lord-
 “ships are now assembled in pursuance
 “of that adjournment, and it is for the
 “House to determine what course it is
 “proper to pursue. Under the circum-
 “stances which I have stated, I trust in
 “God from the favourable symptoms of his
 “Majesty's indisposition, that there will be
 “no necessity for the adoption of any proceed-
 “ing by this House to supply the defect of the
 “Royal authority; and I may be allowed
 “to express my opinion, that the most



"delicate and proper mode of proceeding in the present instance, would be to adjourn for fourteen days."—This motion he then made, and this motion was seconded by LORD MOIRA upon the ground, as stated by him, that no public injury was likely to arise from the delay proposed. —LORD GRENVILLE said, that the House ought to have had laid before it something in the shape of evidence of the improved state of the King's health, and not to be called upon to act upon the bare word of any individual, however respectable that individual might be. He did not, however, oppose the motion for the adjournment. —EARL STANHOPE consented to the adjournment for the purpose of giving ample time for the Scotch and Irish members to arrive and take part in the discussions; but he protested against it upon any other ground, and begged the House to recollect, that the parliament was not a parliament without the King, and without being assembled under his authority. —The EARL of LIVERPOOL and the Duke of NORFOLK each said a few words. The former in favour of, and the latter did not object to the motion. —EARL GREY assented to the adjournment, but he took care to speak in terms of decided reprobation of what was done in 1788, when, he observed, the two Houses assumed to themselves the title and powers of a parliament; and he concluded with expressing his firm hope, that no future steps, beyond the ordinary course of proceeding, would be adopted, without the necessity for such proceedings being fully and clearly in proof before them; and that, above all, they would take especial care, that it was a principle which actuated the minds of all who were raised above the consideration of present objects, that in whatever proceedings it might be deemed necessary to adopt, the common weal should not suffer by any measure which would tend to impair the integrity or power of the Kingly office, or to the diminution of these great necessary constitutional powers with which the Sovereign was vested. —LORD SIDMOUTH spoke in favour of what was done in 1788; and he said, that, with respect to what farther proceedings it might be necessary to adopt, the case was different. They could not, he said, proceed without evidence, fully establishing the fact of the necessity, and the extent to which ulterior measures, if necessary, should be carried, must be controlled by the nature of the evidence.

He thought it, he said, incumbent to state his opinion, that on the present occasion he did not think the conduct of Ministers was a deviation from the principle of 1788. Before the next meeting he hoped they might indulge the hope, that some important change might take place, and put circumstances in the train the most desired by the country at large. —After this the motion of Lord Chancellor Eldon was carried without a division, and the House adjourned, accordingly, to Thursday the 29th day of the present month. —In the HOUSE OF COMMONS the debate was of much greater length, and became of much greater interest, in consequence of a motion made by SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, upon which the House finally came to a division. —As we are here upon a most important subject, where almost every circumstance must become matter for history, and where to every word it may shortly be necessary to refer, I shall insert the whole of the speech of MR. SPENCER PERCEVAL (the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Prime Minister), made upon this occasion, to a House consisting of 401 Members, besides those who may have gone away previous to the division; which speech, in order that no suspicion may attach to my selection, I take from the Morning Post, which, as is well known, is called a ministerial news-paper, and which, as we shall see by and by, has made some most indecent comments upon the speech of Sir Francis Burdett. —MR. PERCEVAL's speech is given as follows:—"Sir—The House of Commons having again assembled without any notification of his Majesty's pleasure that they should do so, I feel it a duty incumbent on me to offer myself to their notice; conceiving that the House must necessarily be anxious to hear what his Majesty's servants have to state on the subject which has occasioned our peculiar situation, and conceiving also that they must be desirous to understand what is the view which his Majesty's servants take of that situation, and what are the measures which they mean to propose in consequence. After having stated, therefore, the ground for such a proposition, I shall humbly submit to the House the propriety, at their rising, of adjourning to the 29th instant. In the first place, Sir, I must observe that when I had last the honour of addressing you, I should have been very much disposed to propose the adjournment to

" the 29th, instead of to the present day,
 " had I thought we had assembled in such
 " numbers and under such circumstances
 " as would have justified us in taking into
 " consideration a question of such magni-
 " tude and importance; but with the as-
 " semblage that then took place, I thought
 " it incumbent on me to propose no other
 " step than that by which the fullest at-
 " tendance of Members might be insured
 " at the earliest possible day. No man
 " can doubt that the indisposition of his
 " Majesty having prevented him from giv-
 " ing to his servants his consent for the
 " further prorogation of Parliament, it
 " became our constitutional duty, and that
 " of the other House of Parliament, to
 " consider what ought to be done. But
 " not only was it our duty to consider
 " what ought to be done, but also at what
 " period that which was to be done was to
 " commence, and on what ground or in-
 " formation we would proceed to do any
 " thing. The House having assembled
 " on the 1st inst. not only without notifi-
 " cation, but contrary to notification, I
 " did not conceive that we were plac-
 " ed in a situation in which it would be
 " proper for us to enter into a consider-
 " ation of any public question of import-
 " ance, and I therefore, with their unani-
 " mous concurrence, proposed an adjourn-
 " ment to the present day. It is not ne-
 " cessary for me, Sir, to go at any length
 " into the circumstances which at that
 " period induced me at one time to con-
 " template the propriety of proposing a
 " longer adjournment. There were many
 " advantages which the House might have
 " derived from the occurrence of events
 " that might have occurred between the
 " 1st and the 29th instant. There was
 " also this strong fact, that except as the
 " circumstances of the Government were
 " altered by his Majesty's indisposition,
 " there was no public reason for requiring
 " the meeting of Parliament sooner than
 " the usual period. But, Sir, if that was
 " the view which the House might have
 " then taken of the subject, I now address
 " you under circumstances in which, if a
 " doubt existed then, no doubt can now
 " exist; because, Sir, having felt it my
 " duty to proceed this morning to Wind-
 " sor for the purpose of procuring as clear
 " and explicit information as possible,
 " with respect to the state of his Majesty's
 " health, I have the satisfaction to acquaint
 " the House, that I have seen his Majes-
 " ty's Physicians, and that they are una-

" nimously of opinion, *That his Majesty*
 " *is in a state of progressive amendment; and*
 " *that a very considerable amendment has ac-*
 " *tually taken place.* On this statement,
 " Sir, so truly cheering, and so consonant
 " to the wishes and to the prayers of his
 " Majesty's subjects, I ground the motion
 " with which I shall conclude, for adjourn-
 " ing this House to the day originally de-
 " scribed in the Royal Proclamation.
 " That the statement which I have been
 " so happy as to be enabled to make, will
 " be most grateful to the House and to the
 " Country, I cannot possibly doubt; and
 " unless peculiar difficulties and embarrass-
 " ments existed, which actually do not
 " exist, I am persuaded that the House,
 " will not hesitate in adopting the delay
 " which I recommend, in preference to
 " the institution of any measure of a pub-
 " lic nature under the present circum-
 " stances. Reserving to myself the right
 " of making any further observations,
 " should a discussion arise on the ques-
 " tion, I move you, Sir, *That this House,*
 " *at its rising, do adjourn for a fortnight.*"

—Mr. WHITBREAD followed, and, after
 some introductory remarks, in reference
 to the conduct of the Ministers in not hav-
 ing given sufficient notice to the members,
 previous to the last meeting, he said, that,
 after the lapse of a fortnight, and the King
 not being in a state to transact the public
 business, the two Houses, being now in
 full attendance, ought to proceed to the
 best means of providing for the defici-
 ency; that the *parliament* could not be
 said to be now assembled, there being only
 the *two Houses*; that, if a physical neces-
 sity still existed for an adjournment, he
 should agree to it, but that such physical
 necessity ought now to be recorded on their
 journals; that the House ought not by any
 means, again to adjourn on the mere un-
 supported, uncredited assertion of the
 Chancellor of the Exchequer; that, as to
 the original intention of the King to pro-
 rogue the parliament to the 29th, that
 could have no weight, unless it were
 shown, that the King foresaw what has
 now happened; that, as to the precedent
 of 1788, the times and circumstances were
 wholly different, and that it was unrea-
 sonable to expect, that those, making a
 great part of the Members of the House,
 who had decidedly condemned both the
 present ministers and their measures,
 should now be content to leave the
 ruling of the country in their hands, with-
 out any controul or supervision what-

soever; that it was a great error in the Legislature not to have made a provision for the return of this calamity, and that it ought not now to fall into a similar error; that it was their bounden duty not to suffer this occasion also to pass away; that they ought to *adjourn from day to day*; that, in 1788, the House had better evidence before them, the then Lord Chancellor (Thurlow) having informed the Parliament, that he had had an interview with the King *himself*; that now they were only told, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been told certain things by the Physicians, without even any report of the Physicians being produced, and without any examination of them before the Privy Council; that he could not see, on the score of respect to the feelings of the King, any objection to such report and examination, or to the disclosing and recording of the facts; that he did not mean to dispute the veracity of Mr. Perceval, but that he still thought that common decency would have dictated the producing to the House information in an authentic form; that, though he felt, as much as any man, the reverence and affection due to the person of the King, he felt also a reverence due to the kingly office, and he was sure, that the people should not be accustomed to consider it *unimportant whether the Executive branch of the state were filled or not*. For these reasons he wished for an adjournment from day to day; but, that, as he wished to avoid creating party heats and jealousies, it was not his intention to *divide the House* upon the question.—The speech of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, who followed Mr. Whitbread, I shall, for the reasons I have already given, insert as I find it in the Morning Chronicle, where I find it most at length. He said, "that, agreeing, as he did, in the greater part of the observations which had fallen from the Honourable Gentleman who had just sitten down, he was determined not to let the question go to a decision *without dividing the House upon it*. The Motion now submitted to them he conceived to be one of the most irrational and unconstitutional propositions ever made in that House. He would never consent to compromise the Constitution. Had he been present on the *last day* of meeting, he would have opposed every Motion for adjournment. The Constitution was suspended, and he would not have agreed to a moment's delay, till that

Constitution was restored; but now, after that delay, after deferring so long their duty to the people, were they now still further to postpone it for another fortnight? But the time was not of such importance as the *principle*. What principle was this mode of proceeding calculated to establish? Could the public business go on without the Executive Government? If it could not, why, at such a period, is it to be deferred? and if it could, were Ministers anxious to convince the people that the Executive Branch of the Constitution was a mere nothing? Was there any proceeding more likely to bring that part of the Constitution into contempt? Was it not holding it forth to the country as a mere farce? Were the people to be told, that in the votes of both Houses only consisted the Constitution; that the Crown might be placed on a cushion, or elsewhere, while the two Houses had in themselves all the virtual Government and Constitution of the country? If the present predicament was an awkward one, it was so because the House had not, in the first instance, done its duty, and not because the line of their duty was doubtful or difficult to discover. As to the mode of proceeding which they ought now to adopt, there could be no doubt or difficulty about it. He felt for the personal sufferings of the King, as every man must feel, but they need not, nor ought they to interfere with the discharge of their duty both to the King and to the People. He felt for the King, but he felt more for the perils of the Country. Was it treating the House of Commons with common decency to call on them to postpone their duty to the people at a period of such emergency, upon the mere *ipse dixit* of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? As to the distinction of seeing the King's physicians, and not the King himself, it did not weigh with him, because in either case it would have been but the mere assertion of an individual, and therefore no ground for parliamentary proceedings. Let the individual assertion have been what it might, he would have voted the same way. He would never agree to compromise the duties of that House to the Constitution, nor willingly submit to any power extended beyond it. The Act passed by a very prevalent and powerful faction against his Royal Highness the Prince

"of Wales, never should have had his
 "sanction; an Act that put him into lead-
 "ing strings, that threw him back into the
 "stage of infancy, and made him a sort of
 "constructive lunatic, enacting him in-
 "capable of acting or of judging without
 "the co-operation and controul of certain
 "of the legislators; as it were stultifying
 "him this moment, when the next, by
 "the laws of the land, might have raised
 "him to the Crown of these kingdoms,
 "and lifted him out of a cradle to have
 "placed him on a Throne. The same
 "course was now about to be adopted, as
 "far as in them lay. He would resist it,
 "and if he stood alone he was determin-
 "ed to divide the House. If the Ministers
 "were resolved, at the risk of the coun-
 "try's safety, at all hazards to prolong to
 "the utmost limit, the tenure by which
 "they held their places and their power,
 "they and others might do so; but he
 "would not go back to the people to tell
 "them that after the Constitution had
 "been suspended for a fortnight, he had
 "voted that it should be suspended for a
 "fortnight longer. A state of anarchy
 "had existed sufficiently long. He would
 "do what he could to restore to the peo-
 "ple the government of the Constitution."

—This speech, a speech, as, I am con-
 vinced, the reader will agree with me,
 full of just views, and expressing, in every
 sentence, sentiments of *real* loyalty and
 attachment to the *real* constitution of the
 country, is, as we shall by-and-by see, an
 object of the foulest abuse in one of those
 prints called ministerial papers, from their
 constant praises of *all* that the ministers
 say and do.—Mr. TIERNEY, in addition
 to what had been said by Mr. Whitbread,
 said, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer
 had not held out any prospect of the King
 being able to attend to business before the
 expiration of the time to which it was pro-
 posed to adjourn; and he concluded by say-
 ing, that, if put to a vote, he should vote
 against the adjournment. He said after-
 wards in explanation, that neither he nor
 any of his friends wished the parliament
 to do any thing immediately; neither did
 they wish the physicians to be examined
 at the bar. He only wanted some authen-
 tic grounds, whereon to vote for the ad-
 journment.—Lord ARCHIBALD HAMIL-
 TON, for reasons similar to those of Mr.
 Whitbread, said that he should vote against
 the adjournment.—Mr. PONSONBY wish-
 ed that the length of the adjournment
 might be reduced to a week. He felt, he

said, great reluctance in voting for the
 motion; but, if pressed to a division, he
 should do it, lest his opposition should be
 considered as a mark of want of respect
 and affection for the King.—Mr. CAN-
 NING having, in support of the adjourn-
 ment, referred to the instance and prece-
 dent of 1804, Mr. CHARLES WYNNE said,
 that the case in 1804, was mainly different
 from the present, for on that occasion it was
 the intention of an hon. gentleman, not
 now a Member of the House, to submit a
 motion on the subject, and he asked his
 Majesty's Ministers, as to the state of his
 Majesty, who answered him that there
 was *no interruption to the exercise of the
 royal functions*; that his Majesty was com-
 petent to all that was required of him.
 The case was not so now, and the House,
 was not to be considered as a Parliament,
 but as the Meeting of the States of the
 Realm. It was necessary to ascertain
 from the best possible evidence the state
 of the Royal health, before he could con-
 sent to vote for the adjournment.—
 He would have been, however, he said,
 much better pleased with the mode of
protesting, pointed out by Mr. WHITBREAD;
 but, that he could not refrain from ex-
 pressing his opinion.—We now come to
 the speech of Mr. SHERIDAN, which I will
 also insert as I find it in the news-papers,
 because it is the only speech that contained
 any thing in the way of answer to Sir
 FRANCIS BURDETT, and how far it is an
answer, the reader will easily judge, if, in-
 deed, he be able to exercise his judgment
 and his less serious faculties at the same
 time.—After having expressed his con-
 viction and his great pleasure, that the
 King's malady was greatly amended, he
 said (See Morning Chronicle), that "He
 "should not be inclined to object to the
 "proposition of his Hon. Friend (Pon-
 "sonby), that the adjournment should
 "only take place for a week, if agreeing to
 "that modification of the proposition
 "could produce what was so highly de-
 "sirable on the present occasion, *unani-*
mity. The Hon. Baronet (Burdett,) how-
 "ever, was against any adjournment what-
 "ever; and he would wish to know what
 "that Hon. Baronet would propose that the
 "House should do? The Hon. Baronet said
 "that the House should not adjourn for a
 "single day, or consent to remain in the
 "state in which they were for a moment.
 "Would the Hon. Bart. wish them now
 "to proceed in providing for the suspension of
 "the Executive functions? If so, he presum-

“ed they would proceed to provide for
 “that emergency in the ordinary form.
 “The matter then came to this: *Was the*
 “*House in a condition now to proceed in the*
 “*ordinary form?* An Hon. Friend of his
 “had said, that this was the second in-
 “stance of his Majesty’s unhappy malady
 “becoming matter of inquiry in that
 “House—[He was corrected by an Ho-
 “nourable Member and proceeded.]—It
 “was *unpleasant* to refer to this, as a matter
 “of calculation, but he was now informed
 “that this was the fourth recurrence of a
 “similar malady. Be it so, but, *still*, the
 “remembrance of *four instances of affliction*
 “must bring along with it the *consoling re-*
 “*collection of four instances of recovery.*
 “His Hon. Friend opposite had referred
 “to the year 1801, and not to the year
 “1804. That case, however, it was said,
 “did not apply to the present. This he
 “could not agree to. If Parliament was
 “legally opened, and it was afterwards
 “found that his Majesty was incapacitated
 “from the discharge of his functions, Par-
 “liament was equally bound to proceed
 “in providing the remedy as if the inca-
 “pacity had manifested itself previous to
 “their meeting, and had been the occasion
 “of their assembling prematurely. It
 “was the duty of Parliament to proceed
 “on the notoriety of the fact, as much as
 “on the manifestation of the incapability
 “displayed in the want or omission of an
 “essential public act. On the occasion
 “of his Majesty’s affliction in 1801, one
 “of his Majesty’s Ministers had continued
 “in office, declaring that his Majesty
 “could not receive the seals of office from
 “him. At that period his Majesty con-
 “tinued in this state for a longer period
 “than on the present occasion. A Gen-
 “tleman, not now in the House, did give
 “notice of a motion for an inquiry into
 “the subject; but, on the day on which
 “the motion was to have come on, he (Mr.
 “Sheridan) anticipated it, by moving the
 “question of adjournment, which was car-
 “ried. In a few days it was clear and
 “manifest that there was no occasion for
 “such a motion, and no such motion was
 “ever made. He knew that one of his
 “Majesty’s first inquiries, after his re-
 “covery, was *whether any Parliamentary in-*
 “*quiry had been made into his situation*, and
 “that it proved the *most gratifying thing to*
 “*his feelings that no such inquiry had taken*
 “*place* (cries of ORDER! ORDER!) He was
 “sorry to be out of order. But this he
 “presumed he might be allowed to say,

“without any breach of order, that by an
 “adjournment for the time proposed, there
 “was reason to think that all further discus-
 “sion on this calamitous subject would be ren-
 “dered unnecessary, a circumstance which
 “he knew must be highly gratifying to
 “the feelings of the House and of the
 “Country.”—Mr. SHERIDAN seems, from
 this report of his speech, to have been ex-
 tremely anxious, that Sir Francis Burdett
 should name some act which he wished to
 have done, which, indeed, the Baronet had
 clearly enough done; so clearly as to
 leave no doubt at all in my mind, and, I
 believe, it could leave no doubt in the
 mind of any man who heard him. He
 wished, doubtless, that the House should,
 on this very day (Friday the 16th) set
 about an inquiry into the real actual state
 of the King’s malady, and, if they found
 it to be such as called for the measure,
 that they should then adopt the measure
 necessary to supply the deficiency. This
 was his wish, to be sure; for, to suppose
 him to have any other, would be to sup-
 pose him not to be at all acquainted with
 his duty.—But, what Mr. SHERIDAN
 could mean by asking, whether the House
 was in a condition to proceed in the ordinary
 form, I am, for my part, wholly at a loss to
 discover. Suppose the King’s unhappy ma-
 lady were to continue for a year, or for
 seven years, the House would, at the end
 of that time, unless the deficiency were
 supplied, be in just the same condition that
 it was in yesterday. Did Mr. Sheridan
 mean, that the House had not sufficient in-
 formation before it? If so, the readiest way
 was to set about an immediate inquiry; for,
 in what other way is it to come at suffi-
 cient information? It was not Sir Francis
 Burdett who had called the House toge-
 ther. The members, and he amongst the
 rest, had been called by an Order of the
 House and by a circular letter of the
 Speaker; and, being so called, it was his
 opinion, apparently, that the House ought
 to do something more before they sepa-
 rated, than merely listen to a bare asser-
 tion (however true it might be) of the mi-
 nister; for, if the House, upon having heard
 that assertion, were to separate for 14
 days without doing any thing, upon the
 ground of such a precedent, why may they
 not separate for another 14 days, on the
 29th of the month, in virtue of another
 such assertion? That Mr. Sheridan’s
 wishes, and even his opinion, may be, as
 he said, “that all further discussion on the
 “calamitous subject will, by the 29th, be

“rendered unnecessary,” I am by no means inclined to make matter of dispute; but his wishes, however sincere, may be disappointed, and his opinion (not more likely to be correct for coinciding with his wishes) may prove erroneous. And, if this should be the case, what argument can, by Mr. Sheridan, be urged against another 14 days adjournment, if the same statement that has now been made should again be made by the minister?—SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY agreed with Mr. Whitbread and Sir Francis Burdett. “He would,” he said, “ask those Gentlemen who reasoned in that way, was it nothing to consent to an adjournment for a fortnight, to put it out of their power during fourteen days to resort to any measures, which a possible, not to say a probable, contingency might render necessary? Was it to do nothing, to deprive themselves by such a proceeding of all opportunity, during that interval, of faithfully discharging those important duties which their constituents sent them there to perform? It was upon this ground that he felt himself bound to oppose the adjournment for a fortnight, with a view if that should be negatived to support an adjournment for twenty-four hours. In doing this, he was persuaded, *he was taking the most effectual mode of shewing his loyalty, his affection, and attachment to his Majesty*; because nothing could so directly tend to support and strengthen the *best interests of the Crown*, than that, during a period when there was a possibility of the occurrence of great national dangers and disasters, that House should be ready to resort to such measures as the exigency of the case might require.”—MR. BRAGGE was for the adjournment, and MR. ELLIOT against it. The latter urged, very forcibly, the necessity of adhering to the principles of the constitution, and the objections to the adjourning upon such grounds as the bare assertion of a minister.—MR. WILBERFORCE declared for the adjournment; and, at the close of his speech, the House divided, when there appeared for the Adjournment 343, and against it 58.—We are now to see what the Morning Post news-paper has said upon the subject of this debate, and especially upon the subject of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT’S speech. It begins thus:—“Both Houses of Parliament met yesterday pursuant to the last adjournment, when, in consequence of the happy and

“progressive improvement in the state of his Majesty’s health, a further adjournment for a fortnight was agreed to; in the Lords, *nem. diss.* and in the Commons by a gratifying and triumphant majority of 343 to 58; nor would the minority on this occasion, insignificant as it is, have amounted to any thing beyond the contemptible *Wardleite* and *Burdettite* Members, had not the mischievous sir Francis artfully entrapped several Members of the Opposition Party to divide with him upon the question so very indelicately pressed by him upon the House.—With very few exceptions, there was displayed in both Houses, on this occasion, a most creditable and becoming sympathy, and the conduct of Lord Moira and Mr. Sheridan, who on all occasions of real national importance are ever actively to be found at their post, is entitled to our best commendations. In the House of Lords, notwithstanding some observations from Lords Grenville and Grey, to the justice or necessity of which we can by no means subscribe, the question of adjournment was carried, as we have already observed, *nem. diss.*; nor would there have been any division in the Commons, where the Opposition were unwilling to expose the weakness of their numbers, had not Sir Francis Burdett, after some reprehensible and insidious insinuations, relative to the exercise of the Executive Power, entrapped Mr. Whitbread and some others, who to hide a still greater shame, and wear the semblance of consistency, found themselves compelled to vote with the mischievous Baronet. We are not, however, displeased at the patriotic expedient to which the worthy Sir Francis has thus had recourse, as it serves to shew how contemptible are the numbers of those whose nature is debased by the vile views of faction, and whose unmanly feelings and ungenerous hearts forbid, as it were, their sympathy, in a case which, to the everlasting honour of the country be it related, so deeply interests the best feelings, and fills with keen solicitude the fond bosoms of a people, who in duly appreciating his virtues, prove themselves deserving the best Monarch that ever adorned a Throne.”—It was this same writer, who a few weeks ago, accused the Emperor of France and his ministers of boasting of the horrid crime, for which some infamous wretches had

just been exhibited in the Pillory in London; the very same writer, who, since, that, has represented the Empress Maria Louisa, daughter of our late ally, the Emperor of Austria, as being about to be the mother of bastards; and this is the writer, who calls SIR FRANCIS BURDETT mischievous, and who bestows his commendation upon the conduct of MR. SHERIDAN. This is the writer, the leader of all those, who write against those whom they call "Jacobins." This is the writer, who accuses Sir Francis Burdett of disloyal designs. And, from these circumstances alone, the man of sense will be able to form a pretty correct judgment of what is the real tendency of such designs.—But, will this publication be suffered to pass unnoticed by the House of Commons? MR. GALE JONES was sent to Newgate for questioning the propriety of the conduct of one of the members. Now here is a writer, who publishes to the world, that the conduct of one of the members, in opposing a motion of the minister, is "*reprehensible, insidious, and mischievous*;" and, who describes all those, who voted against the minister, as being persons "*who by nature are debased by the vile views of faction*," and whose "*hearts and feelings are unmanly and ungenerous*."—This is what the writer of the Morning Post dares do. This is what the most venal of the venal dares publish. This is what he is not in the least afraid to promulgate and to vend. We shall see, now, whether *this* will be noticed by the House. I beg the reader to bear it in mind, and to observe, that the abuse is extended to the whole of the 68 members, who were not to be prevailed upon to refrain from voting against the minister; that it is levelled at the very character of every one of those, who voted against the minister's motion.—Sir Francis Burdett's conduct, upon this occasion, was in perfect agreement with all his former declarations relative to the nature of the kingly functions and office. He has always deprecated any attempt to chip away the just prerogatives of the King. He has always said, that one of the ends of a parliamentary reform was to make the King independent of cabals and factions. He has always said that he wished to see the King in a state to make it necessary for him to consult only the wishes and good of his people. He has, in short, always said, that he found no danger to liberty from the power of the King, exercised without any controul from combina-

tions of men; and that every thing which tended to the placing of the kingly power in other hands was dangerous, in the extreme, to the liberties of the people. Thus, then, has his conduct, upon this occasion, been the natural consequence of all the opinions, which he has, at any time, uttered respecting the Royal Office and Authority.—Sir Francis Burdett wanted to entrap nobody. He knew very well, that the greater part of those who voted with him yesterday had no liking to his political views. But, it was for him to do his duty, regardless of whether he had 50 or 1 vote with him. It was nothing to him, personally, whether the thing went on or not. He had nothing to gain and nothing to lose by any change that could take place. He had no hopes and no fears of a private nature. Nothing to whet him on into eagerness for a Regency, and nothing to make him affect a desire to postpone the accomplishment of a life of longing. Nothing to give a real blunt or a sham keenness to his feelings for an aged and most afflicted sovereign. He had, and he could have no motive for saying, upon such an occasion, what was not the genuine sentiments of his mind. These sentiments he uttered, regardless, as far as concerned himself, whether they were supported by others or not; and in so doing he has added another to his many former claims to the People's approbation and confidence.—As to the subject of the Regency, that subject, upon which every one talks in private, and so few in public, why, in the name of common sense, should men feel any shyness? Those, indeed, who are hunting after office, and who are afraid to look either to the right or to the left, may reasonably be shy; but, why should any body else? Why should any man, who has nothing to fear from the ups and downs of parties, be shy or timid or backward upon this subject more than upon any other? There are some men, who seem to avoid it with the same caution that weak minds turn from the making of a will. But, supposing the implied apprehensions to be just, and which I suppose only for argument's sake, is it not manifest, that the King's faculties cannot be restored nor his life preserved by avoiding to speak of his present malady or of his possibly approaching death, which must come sooner or later, and which, as with all other men, though it may yet be distant, may also be very near? It is, to say the very best of it,

therefore, contemptible weakness to avoid the subject of a Regency, and it is something infinitely worse than contemptible weakness to attempt to make the world believe, that this shyness arises from any thing like tenderness towards the King. The good of it is that there are none of our young lords or 'squires (if there are any of the latter left in England) have any scruple at all to contemplate the prospect of their father's death, and to talk, with perfect composure, of what they will do in case of that event. Whose son does not do this? And what father has not done it before him? Away, then, with all this affected tenderness towards the King; and let us, as in other cases of human decline, talk like men of sense and sincerity, and let all our sorrows for the unhappy malady of the father, be accompanied by hopes in his son and lawful successor. There is but one other way, and that is to hold our tongues.

WM. COBBETT.

State Prison, Newgate, Friday,
November 16, 1810.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPAIN.—*Proceedings of the Cortes.*
(Continued from page .)

October 4.—A plan from general Vel-laba was presented, respecting the augmentation and other regulations of the cavalry, which was reserved to be finally discussed.—CAPMANY observed, that the Spanish language being very copious, all foreign expressions ought to be rejected, especially French expressions, with which the regulations were overloaded: he condemned, therefore the words, march, motion, assembly, session, mission, retire, guarantee, honourable, and bar: he objected to some on account of their real import, and to others on account of the meaning which was attached to them. "Gentlemen," he concluded, "We must both live and die Spaniards."—Deputy MEXIA ascended the tribune, and complained of the infidelity of the Conciso, in its manner of printing the deliberations of that Congress, and the little respect shewn in the said paper to its members.—TENREIROS demanded that their debates should only be on war and the means of exterminating their enemies. The President replied, that this was one of the great objects of their labours, and an end which would only be obtained through the regular means.—A

Member proposed the reading of some police regulations, which should have the air of an order from the Cortes, in order that after being compared with the former one, the best might be preferred.—The President ordered the public to withdraw at noon, and the sitting continued until half after four o'clock.

October 5.—MEXIA proposed certain regulations respecting the Royal Bank notes, in order to distinguish those circulated in the free provinces, from the others; but they came to no resolution.—CAPMANY complained, likewise, of the inaccuracy of the Conciso, and of its want of respect towards the National Deputies. On this account the propriety was suggested by Perez de Castro, of admitting a periodical publication, proposed by Oliveros, and edited by an officer of the military college, applying the products to the benefit of this useful establishment; which judicious proposal was approved.—OLIVEROS recommended the translation of the Cortes to Cadiz, pointing out the church of St. Philip as a very eligible spot; but on this important motion, nothing was finally settled.—The regulations were again examined, on which they debated upwards of two hours. The zealous Gonzales exclaimed, "Let us debate only on war and on justice." At the conclusion it was settled, that extraordinary sittings should be held from 8 to 10 at night, to be wholly occupied in the wished for regulations.—OLIVEROS mentioned his being informed from Cadiz, that the Executive Government had issued orders prohibiting any discussions on the Cortes at any public meeting.—The Cortes passed a resolution to make enquiries respecting this subject of the Regency.

October 6.—The sitting began with a petition from the Cardinal to be allowed to take the oath; and after some deliberations, on account of the peculiar circumstances, it was accorded.—It was resolved to intimate to the Regency, the wishes of the Cortes that their acts should be regularly published in a Gazette.

October 7.—The Count of Norona asked permission to speak, and his object being investigated by two deputies, it was resolved to hear him in private at one o'clock p. m. —MEXIA proposed some commercial regulations to be committed to a Junta, in which two members from that of Cadiz, and an equal number of Americans, should

be incorporated. The Congress granted a commission to this effect, comprising also agriculture, arts and sciences, but omitted the circumstance of the proposal.—FLERRETA complained of the violation of secrecy observed respecting the letters which were opened at the Post-office.—HUELTA exclaimed against this proceeding, and maintained this to be the worst period to adopt such a measure, when the provinces must necessarily communicate subjects of importance to their deputies, which it was highly proper should be kept from the executive power. The public retired at one, and the debates were privately continued till four o'clock.

October 8.—On this day several memorials were read respecting various branches of the revenue; and a project presented by ARGUELLES, respecting the liberty of the press, being the fruit of the labours of the commission charged with the same.—Nothing was ultimately decided, but the nation may flatter itself, because the opinion of all illustrious men will be heard. It is indeed a reflection on the human mind that there should be any one daring enough to write against the liberty of the press: to such an individual only it ought not to be free.—The answer from the executive power to the question proposed by the Cortes, respecting the order mentioned by Oliveros, in the 5th day's sitting, was read. The Regency has never forbidden any discussion on the Cortes, and the only thing it may charge its agents and ministers with is to watch over their calumniators.

October 9.—The Cardinal de Bourbon took the oath, after which the President addressed him in the following terms;—"The blood which flows through your veins, as well as that purple, recommends you to this Assembly."—A Secretary board, consisting of five members, was instituted, for which employment officers of the army, who are unable to undergo the fatigues of a campaign, are to be preferred. Three deputies were also named to investigate and report the merits of the candidates.—The President mentioned his having received several anonymous communications, complaining of the slowness in the operations of the Cortes. He ordered the public to withdraw at twelve o'clock, and the sitting was continued until three.

October 10.—A Deputy for La Mancha

took the oaths in the usual form. Perez de Castro made mention of a plan both defensive and offensive for this Isle, presented by General Galuzzo; and of another with regard to the cavalry, by the Marquis del Palacio; both were sent to the Commission of War to be examined. There was also read a circular letter from Senor Llorente, Inspector General of the Public Health, with regard to its present state. It declared that the number of sick persons was very small; and in order to calm the fears to which several unfounded reports had given rise, it added, the number of infectious disorders was unusually small.

October 13.—OLIVEROS, one of the most zealous members of the august Congress, and Deputy for Estremadura, read a memorial, in which he painted, in the most lively colours, the disorders in which the French leave those districts which they abandon, the numberless evils which their commissaries have caused by their requisitions of men and provisions, the waste of all resources, and the miseries, in particular, of the cultivators of the ground, by having to support the enemies armies and their own; the decline of the manufactures of common cloths, in consequence of the manufactories being stripped of them without payment, in order to clothe the different armies:—the consequences of all which would be poverty, nakedness, and a general famine, if proper measures were not adopted. He then proposed such measures as appeared to him to be proper, for the purpose of being transmitted to the respective Commissioners of War, Finance, &c.; concluding with proposing the appointment of a commission for regulating and organising the provinces, which might guard against evils such as those which they had already suffered, and repair them in the best possible manner. Considering these matters as urgent, and calling for precedency before others—the Cortes passed a decree to this effect.

October 14.—In a former sitting ARGUELLES had produced the plan of a law on the liberty of the press, which comprised, first, the limits of that liberty, and the penalties for transgressors; and secondly, the appointment of a Junta of learned men, with the title of *Supreme Council Protector of the Liberty of the Press*, in order to protect it from ministerial despotism, and from tyranny.—It was

agreed that this plan should be printed, and copies distributed among all the Deputies, in order that they might consider the subject maturely, and be prepared to discuss it.—This day, the plan being again read, Tenreiro opposed it, alledging, that it was not right to discuss such an important topic without the concurrence of the Deputies who were still wanting.—What! (replied another Member), without their presence the Cortes were installed; without their presence, the Spanish people recovered their sovereignty, an event which will form an era in our annals; and is it possible, that for an affair not of such importance, we are to wait for a few Deputies?—"But the discussion of it was not fixed for to day."—"It was," replied various individuals. This was confirmed by the President. "We do not come prepared," replied another; upon which LUXAN ascended the tribune, and the plan was read.—TENREIRO rose again: he declaimed against the liberty of the press, and represented it as the origin of the ruin of empires. (He would not, however, permit himself to see that this liberty supports the British empire). Some disapprobation was expressed, but Tenreiro continued to go on, till at last the disapprobation became more marked.—ARGUELLES then ascended the tribune. He shewed that the want of a free communication of ideas had given arms to the Tyrant for our destruction; that the English, aware of the cunning arts of those who meant to oppress them, gave freedom to the pen and liberty to the press; they disentangled and established their principles; they unveiled the plots of their enemies, and refuted their sophisms; their people were instructed, and not left exposed to illusion: by such means they were all united, and rendered themselves invincible. The reverse had been the fate of the Spaniards; deprived of its free course, knowledge became stagnant, the learned remained dumb, the ignorant were imposed upon; hence divisions, disunion, the ruin of the nation, and the exaltation of the enemy.—MEXIA succeeded, and with exquisite erudition and animated eloquence proved, that the sacred writings, our venerable religion, history and reason, favoured the liberty of the press.—It was resolved that the discussion should be continued on the following day.—To day at 10 in the morning, the troops took the oath to

the Cortes in the field at Torrealto, in presence of General LAPENA. The concourse of people was innumerable, the spectacle very fine, and the enthusiasm of all, both soldiers and peasants, was equal.

October 16.—There was read a Decree of the Cortes passed yesterday, on the claims of the Americans; in which it was declared, That the Spanish dominions in both hemispheres form one sole monarchy, one sole nation, one sole family; and that the native born subjects of the European and ultramarine dominions are equal in rights to those of this Peninsula; leaving it as the province of the Cortes to discuss all measures relating to the prosperity of those beyond sea, as well as of the form of the national representation and number of its members in both hemispheres; declaring also that, in all those transatlantic provinces where any commotions have taken place, there shall be a general act of oblivion with regard to them, from the moment when the sovereign authority which resides in the mother country is acknowledged.

October 18.—A letter was read, in which the Junta of Estremadura felicitated the Cortes, &c.—Various projects and memorials were transmitted to the respective commissions.—The discussion upon the liberty of the press followed. Senor GARCIA HERREROS was for liberty of the press without any censorship, in imitation of the Supreme Tribunal, which never took upon itself to censure any book before it was printed.—Senor MEXIA read an article from the Gazette, which mentioned, "that Buonaparté had decreed, that there should be only one newspaper, of which the Prefect was to be censor." He added, that the Cortes ought not to wish to resemble Buonaparté.—Senor ARGUELLES pronounced an eulogium on the discourse of Munoz TORRERO in a former discussion on this subject, and refuted that of Llaneras. He observed, that the best mode of correcting man was the liberty of the press; and noticed, that during the ministry of Godoy, when there were censors, altars were raised to lasciviousness, &c. He defied any one to say that three ages of disorders arising from the liberty of the press could produce such great evils as those we have suffered from the want of it.

(To be continued.)